



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,928	01/09/2006	Christoph Herrmann	DE030245	3779
24737	7590	07/18/2011	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			ANWAR, MOHAMMAD S	
P.O. BOX 3001				
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2463	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/18/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

vera.kublanov@philips.com
debbie.henn@philips.com
marianne.fox@philips.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/563,928	HERRMANN ET AL	
	Examiner MOHAMMAD ANWAR	Art Unit 2463	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 May 2011.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 5/3/11 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Please see response below in **bold**:

In response to applicant argument, wherein the REV confirmation message is transmitted when the receiver decodes an error-free second data packet transmitted consecutively after transmission of the first data packet and transmitted with a Network Data Incoming (NDI) indicator (**see Dudley's column 7 lines 39-58; column 10 lines 37-44, status packet refers to Revert confirmation message which indicates the current packet received successfully and if the previous packet is missing or gaps by using sequence number indication**).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
4. Claims 1-2, 5-16, 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuchibhotla et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,414,989) in view of Dudley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,754,754) and Kim et al. (U.S. PGPub. No. 2003/0043764 A1).

For claims 1, 8,10, 11 and 12, Kuchibhotla et al. disclose method of transmitting data packets from a transmitter to a receiver (see column 7 lines 41-52), wherein an indicator is sent along with each data packet of the data packets (see column 10 lines 46-47, a new data indicator NDI); wherein the indicator indicates whether the respective data packet is a new data packet (see column 14 lines 1-2, where NDI bit indicates it is a new data) or a re-sent data packet (see column 13 lines 60-61, where NDI bit indicates it is previous or resent data); wherein, when the receiver receives a first data packet with an error, the receiver sends a negative confirmation (NACK) message to the transmitter (see column 5 lines 30-32, where a NACK is sent); and wherein, if the receiver subsequently decodes an error-free second data packet that

was sent along with the indicator indicating that the second data packet is a new data packet, the receiver sends a revert (REV) confirmation message that acknowledges receipt of the second data packet and requests the transmitter to re-send the first data packet (see column 14 lines 27-30 where an NDE indication of 0 and 1 with the acknowledgement scheme can ask the transmitter to resend or not send the previous data), wherein the REV confirmation message is transmitted by the receiver consequent on receiving the most recently transmitted data packet (see column 13 lines 57-59).

Kuchibhotla et al. disclose all the subject matter but fails to mention wherein the REV confirmation message is a pre-determined signal that informs the transmitter that a gap exists in a memory of the receiver due to a missing data packet transmitted consecutively before the most recently transmitted data packet; wherein the REV confirmation message is transmitted when the receiver decodes an error-free second data packet transmitted consecutively after transmission of the first data packet and transmitted with a Network Data Incoming (NDI) indicator. However, Dudley et al. from a similar field of endeavor disclose wherein the REV confirmation message is a pre-determined signal (see column 7 lines 30-35, status packet with predefined flags) that informs the transmitter that a gap exists in a memory of the receiver due to a missing data packet transmitted consecutively before the second data packet (column 10 lines 37-4, a status packet or rev confirmation message with gaps), the missing data packet being retransmitted without a delay (see column 3 lines 31-33); wherein the REV confirmation message is transmitted when the receiver decodes an error-free second data packet transmitted consecutively after transmission of the first data packet and

transmitted with a Network Data Incoming (NDI) indicator (see column 7 lines 39-58; column 10 lines 37-44, status packet refers to Revert confirmation message which indicates the current packet received successfully and if the previous packet is missing by using sequence number indication). Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to include Dudley et al. gap scheme into Kuchibhotla et al. ack/nack scheme. The method can be implemented in a packet. The motivation of doing this is to promptly notify the sender station of an error (see column 3 lines 24-26). Kuchibhotla et al. and Dudley et al. disclose all the subject matter but fails to mention retransmitted with a delay or disregarded for retransmission. However, Kim et al. from a similar field of endeavor disclose retransmitted with a delay (see para. 99) or disregarded for retransmission (see para. 41). Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to include Kim et al. transmission scheme into Kuchibhotla et al. and Dudley transmission scheme. The method can be implemented in a node. The motivation of doing this is to delay or discard retransmission packets as required.

For claim 2, Kuchibhotla et al. disclose wherein, when the receiver receives an error-free data packet, the receiver sends a third an acknowledgement confirmation (ACK) message to the transmitter (see column 16 lines 25-26)

For claim 5, Kuchibhotla et al. disclose wherein the transmitter ignores the revert confirmation message and sends a new third data packet (see column 14 lines 56-57).

For claim 6, Kuchibhotla et al. disclose wherein the indicator has a length of 1 bit (see column 14 lines 1-2 indicates 1 bit either 0 or 1).

For claims 7 and 9, Kuchibhotla et al. disclose wherein the method is an extension of the HARQ protocol in UMTS, and wherein the indicator is sent via the high speed control channel of UMTS (see column 9 lines 39-49, column 4 lines 22-24).

For claim 13, Kuchibhotla et al. disclose sending a negative (NACK) confirmation message from a receiver indicating to the transmitter that an immediately preceding data packet is to be resent (see column 3 lines 34-37), and sending a revert (REV) confirmation message from the receiver if a subsequently received data packet includes an indicator that this received data packet is not a retransmission in response to the negative confirmation message, wherein revert confirmation message is transmitted by the receiver consequent on receiving the subsequently received data packet, wherein the revert confirmation message indicates to the transmitter that the received data packet has been received without error, and that the immediately preceding data packet before the received data packet is to be resent (see column 14 lines 27-30 and column 15 lines 50-54 where it is clearly explained as to acknowledgement and negative acknowledgement messages using NDE bit to indicate if the previous message was received properly or not). Kuchibhotla et al. disclose all the subject matter but fails to mention wherein the REV confirmation message informs the transmitter that a gap exists in a memory of the receiver due to missing data packet transmitted consecutively before the second data packet. However, Dudley et al. from a similar field of endeavor disclose wherein the REV confirmation message is a predetermined signal that informs the transmitter that a gap exists in a memory of the receiver to missing data packet transmitted consecutively before the

received data packet (see column 10 lines 37-44, a status packet or rev confirmation message with gaps), the missing data packet being retransmitted without a delay (see column 3 lines 31-33). Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to include Dudley et al. gap scheme into Kuchibhotla et al. ack/nack scheme. The method can be implemented in a packet. The motivation of doing this is to promptly notify the sender station of an error (see column 3 lines 24-26). Kuchibhotla et al. and Dudley et al. disclose all the subject matter but fails to mention retransmitted with a delay or disregarded for retransmission. However, Kim et al. from a similar field of endeavor disclose retransmitted with a delay (see para. 99) or disregarded for retransmission (see para. 41). Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to include Kim et al. transmission scheme into Kuchibhotla et al. and Dudley transmission scheme. The method can be implemented in a node. The motivation of doing this is to delay or discard retransmission packets as required.

For claim 14, Kuchibhotla et al. disclose wherein the indicator indicates whether the received data packet is a newly transmitted data packet. (see column 14 lines 1-2).

For claim 15, Kuchibhotla et al. disclose including receiving another data packet at the receiver and sending an affirmative (ACK) confirmation message from the receiver if an error is not detected in the another data packet (see column 14 lines 27-30, column 15 lines 39-40 where NDE bit of 1 indicates that the previous data was received properly).

For claim 16, Kuchibhotla et al. disclose transmitting a data packet of a series of data packets from a transmitter to a receiver (see Figure 8 where a series of packets are sent), receiving a revert (REV) confirmation message from the receiver indicating that the data packet has been received satisfactorily at the receiver and that an immediately prior data packet in the series of data packets is to be retransmitted, wherein the REV confirmation message is transmitted by the receiver consequent on receiving the satisfactorily received data packet (see column 14 lines 27-30 where NDE bit of 0 would indicate that the previous data was not received properly), and selectively transmitting the immediately prior data packet (see column 16 lines 56-57). Kuchibhotla et al. disclose all the subject matter but fails to mention wherein the REV confirmation message informs the transmitter that a gap exists in a memory of the receiver due to missing data packet transmitted consecutively before the satisfactorily received data packet. However, Dudley et al. from a similar field of endeavor disclose wherein the REV confirmation message is a predetermined signal that informs the transmitter that a gap exists in a memory of the receiver due to missing data packet transmitted consecutively before the satisfactorily received data packet (see column 10 lines 37-44, a status packet or rev confirmation message with gaps); the missing data packet being retransmitted without delay (see column 3 lines 31-33). Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to include Dudley et al. gap scheme into Kuchibhotla et al. ack/nack scheme. The method can be implemented in a packet. The motivation of doing this is to promptly notify the sender station of an error (see column 3 lines 24-26). Kuchibhotla et al. and Dudley et al.

disclose all the subject matter but fails to mention retransmitted with a delay or disregarded for retransmission. However, Kim et al. from a similar field of endeavor disclose retransmitted with a delay (see para. 99) or disregarded for retransmission (see para. 41). Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to include Kim et al. transmission scheme into Kuchibhotla et al. and Dudley transmission scheme. The method can be implemented in a node. The motivation of doing this is to delay or discard retransmission packets as required.

For claims 19 and 20, Kuchibhotla et al. disclose including receiving an affirmative (ACK) confirmation message and transmitting a next data packet of the series of data packets in response to the affirmative confirmation message, including receiving a negative (NACK) confirmation message and retransmitting the next data packet in response to the negative confirmation message 9see column 3 lines 34-37).

For claim 21, Kuchibhotla et al. disclose at least one transmitter and at least one receiver, wherein each transmitter and receiver is configured to execute a protocol that includes three confirmation message types: an affirmative confirmation (ACK) that signals to the transmitter that a most recently transmitted data packet has been received satisfactorily at the receiver (see column 14 lines 7-8); a negative confirmation (NACK) that signals to the transmitter that the most recently transmitted data packet has not been received satisfactorily at the receiver (see column 14 lines 2-3); and a revert confirmation (REV) that signals to the transmitter that the most recently transmitted data packet has been received and that an immediately prior transmitted data packet has not been received satisfactorily at the receiver (see column 14 lines 27-40, using

ACK/NACK with NDE bit as revert message to indicate if the previous data was received properly or not); wherein the REV confirmation message is transmitted by the receiver consequent on receiving the most recently transmitted data packet (see column 13 lines 57-59). Kuchibhotla et al. disclose all the subject matter but fails to mention wherein the REV confirmation message is a predetermined signal that informs the transmitter that a gap exists in a memory of the receiver due to missing data packet transmitted consecutively before the most recently transmitted data packet. However, Dudley et al. from a similar field of endeavor disclose wherein the REV confirmation message is a predetermined signal that informs the transmitter that a gap exists in a memory of the receiver due to a packet transmitted consecutively before the most recently transmitted data packet (column 10 lines 37-4, a status packet or rev confirmation message with gaps); the missing data packet being retransmitted without a delay (see column 3 lines 31-33). Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to include Dudley et al. gap scheme into Kuchibhotla et al. ack/nack scheme. The method can be implemented in a packet. The motivation of doing this is to promptly notify the sender station of an error (see column 3 lines 24-26). Kuchibhotla et al. and Dudley et al. disclose all the subject matter but fails to mention retransmitted with a delay or disregarded for retransmission. However, Kim et al. from a similar field of endeavor disclose retransmitted with a delay (see para. 99) or disregarded for retransmission (see para. 41). Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to include Kim et al. transmission scheme into Kuchibhotla et al. and Dudley transmission scheme. The

method can be implemented in a node. The motivation of doing this is to delay or discard retransmission packets as required.

5. Claims 3 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuchibhotla et al. in view of Dudley et al. and Kim et al. as applied to claims 1 and 16 above, and further in view of Ulug (Patent No. 4,312,065).

For claims 3 and 18, Kuchibhotla et al., Dudley et al. and Kim et al. disclose all the subject matter but fails to mention wherein a third data packet without data is sent in response to the revert confirmation message. However, Ulug from a similar field of endeavor discloses wherein a third data packet without data is sent in response to the revert confirmation message (see column 17 lines 43-46). Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to include Ulug null packet scheme into Kuchibhotla et al., Dudley et al. and Kim et al. packet transmission scheme. The method can be implemented in a packet transmitter. The motivation of doing this is to control transmission of data packets.

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuchibhotla et al. in view of Dudley et al. and Kim et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Dottling et al. (background U.S. Patent No. 7,249,303).

For claim 4, Kuchibhotla et al., Dudley et al. and Kim et al. disclose all the subject matter but fails to mention wherein the third data packet is sent in response to the revert confirmation message with one of a part of the data with one of a part of the

data originally included in the first data packet and all of data originally included in the first data packet. However, Dottling et al. from a similar field of endeavor disclose wherein the third data packet is sent in response to the revert confirmation message with one of a part of the data with one of a part of the data originally included in the first data packet and all of data originally included in the first data packet (see column 1 lines 39-47). Thus it, would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to include Dottling et al. combination of data in a packet scheme into Kuchibhotla et al., Dudley et al. and Kim et al. packet transmission scheme. The method can be implemented in the packet transmission and receiving unit. The motivation of doing this is to reduce the bandwidth.

7. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuchibhotla et al. in view Dudley et al. and Kim et al. as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Kohno (U.S. PGPub. No. 2003/0120802).

For claim 17, Kuchibhotla et al., Dudley et al. and Kim et al. disclose all the subject matter but fails to mention including selecting to transmit the immediately prior data packet based on a count of prior retransmissions of the immediately prior data packet. However, Kohno from a similar field of endeavor disclose selecting to transmit the immediately prior data packet based on a count of prior retransmissions of the immediately prior data packet (see paragraph 98 lines 1-9, paragraph 111 lines 9-12, reference explains number of counts option). Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to include Kohno count

scheme into Kuchibhotla et al., Dudley et al. and Kim et al. transmission scheme. The method can be implemented in a packet. The motivation of doing this is to reduce the risk of buffer overflow (see paragraph 113 lines 7-11).

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MOHAMMAD ANWAR whose telephone number is (571)270-5641. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 9am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Derrick W. Ferris can be reached on 571-272-3123. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MOHAMMAD ANWAR
Examiner
Art Unit 2463

/M. A./
Examiner, Art Unit 2463

/Derrick W Ferris/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2463